

Technical Note

Project Mayfield
 Subject Hoyle Street Culvert
 Project no 0046688
 Date 19 October 2021

Revision	Description	Issued by	Date	Approved (signature)
00	To support the discharge of condition 86	JR	19/10/2021	PO

1 Introduction

This Technical Note has been produced by Buro Happold on behalf of U+I to support the discharge of planning condition 86 relating to the outline planning permission for the Mayfield Phase 1 development (planning reference 124972/FO/2019. Planning condition 86 states:

"Prior to commencement of any earthworks within the Wildscape Walk area a method statement detailing measures to safeguards the bat roost within the Hoyle Street culvert from lighting, noise and vibration during construction should be submitted and agreed in writing to the LPA. The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full."

This technical note aims to discharge the planning condition by identifying survey evidence gathered to date that indicates that the Hoyle Street Culvert is not considered to support roosting bats and so a sensitive working method statement for works near to the culvert is not required as there will not be disturbance to a bat roost.

2 Surveys to date

A number of bat surveys have been undertaken by Penny Anderson Associates, on behalf of Buro Happold, at the Mayfield site since 2017. These include:

- Initial habitat and building inspection surveys (2017);
- Bat roost and transect activity surveys (2017);
- Update bat inspection and emergence surveys of building 2 and the culverts (2019); and
- Update survey of building 2 (2019).

As part of the initial habitat and building inspection surveys in 2017, the Hoyle Street culvert (identified as B26 in the report) was identified to have high potential to support roosting bats, as defined by best practice guidelines (Collins, 2016), although the culvert itself was not accessed and the potential scoring was based on assumptions.

The subsequent roost activity surveys identified one common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* return to the culvert during a pre-dawn roost return survey and three common pipistrelles exiting the culvert structure during an emergence survey, and so were assumed to have emerged from un-seen features within the culvert itself. No bats were observed to emerge from the structures visible brick work. The culvert was therefore classified as a day roost used by approximately five common pipistrelle bats.

In 2019, access to the culvert was obtained and surveyors walked through the culvert to identify and endoscope any potential roosting features to better pinpoint the roosting locations. The internal inspection identified that the brickwork was intact throughout the culvert and considered to be in good condition offering few crevices. Mortar was found to be intact and the roof walls were considered to have heavy cobwebbing throughout the culvert. The headwall and junction

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit, use and information of U+I for the purposes set out in the Design note or instructions commissioning it. The liability of Buro Happold in respect of the information contained in the report will not extend to any third party. All concepts and proposals are copyright © 1976 – 2021 Buro Happold. All rights reserved. Issued in commercial confidence.

with the culvert were also inspected and considered to have low suitability for roosting due to any cracks present being damp, shallow or filled with soil. The survey concluded that the '*internal structure of the culvert or its headwalls on site would not be suitable for a bat roost*' as initially thought identified during the 2017 activity surveys. The report suggests that the bats were seen to fly through the culvert rather than to be emerging from a roost within it. The Hoyle Street is then no longer considered as a roosting location within the project.

3 Conclusion

Due to the findings of the internal inspection of the Hoyle Street culvert in 2019, it is considered that the culvert is unsuitable to support roosting bats due to the good condition of the brickwork internally and the poor suitability of any potential features due to the damp, shallow, or filled-in nature of the cracks.

It is concluded that works around the culvert will not result in disturbance to a bat roost as it is not considered that the culvert will support one. Therefore, sensitive working methods as required within the wording of condition 86 will not be necessary as there is not a bat roost to protect and mitigate potential impacts to.